[26th November 1955

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : அதைப்பற்றி தனியாக ரெப்ரசென்டேஷன் கொடுக்கும்படியாக கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். ஆயக்கட் நிர்ணயிக்கும் விஷயத்தில் சீபேஜ் முதலியவைகள் குதிரவில்லை. நாளாகும்.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : இந்த வருஷம் ஏராளமாக மழை பெய்து தண்ணீர் அரும்படைத்திருக்கிறது. அதைப்பற்றி ரெவினியூ அதிகாரிகளுக்கு விண்ணப்பம் செய்யப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அப்படி அரும்படிக்கக் கூடிய இடங்களுக்கு இந்த வருஷம் தண்டத் தீர்வை விதிக்காமல் இருக்க சர்க்கார் நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பார்களா ?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : ரயத்துக்களை கேட்காமலேயே ஆபீசர்கள் அதைப்பற்றி விசாரிக்கவேண்டும் என்று உத்தரவு போடப்பட்டிருக்கிறது.

Ambur and Mannarghat Police

* 2908 *Q*.—SRI P. RAMAMURTHI (on behalf of Sri M. Kalyanasundaram) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the police opened fire against the people in front of the Taluk police station, Ambur, North Arcot district, on 7th November 1954;

(*b*) the circumstances under which firing was ordered;

(*c*) the number that died and the number that were injured;

(*d*) whether Government enquired into the conduct of the police; and

(*e*) if so, the result thereof?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (*a*) The answer is in the affirmative.

(*b*) On 5th November 1954, the Sub-Inspector of Police, Ambur taluk, arrested and released on bail, a person named Kannan. The next morning, an unlawful assembly, numbering about 300 brought Kannan to the police station. They alleged that the police had injured Kannan and that he should be given immediate medical treatment at the police station itself. The mob also prevented the removal of Kannan to the Municipal Dispensary. Soon afterwards, the mob entered the police station, caused mischief to the station property, inflicted an injury upon a constable and manhandled the Sub-Inspector. A lathi charge was made after issue of a warning against both, lathi charge and firing. The mob receded a little; but very soon it formed again and advanced upon the police station pelting stones. One of the crowd tried to snatch the musket from a constable. Finding that the lives of the police officials were in danger, the Sub-Inspector of police ordered one of the constables to open fire on the mob. Five rounds were fired in all before the crowd dispersed.

(*c*) Two persons were injured. One of them died on 9th November 1954 and the other on 13th February 1955 after contracting " purulent meningites ".

26th November 1955]

(*d*) & (*e*) The Sub-Collector, Tirupathur, conducted an inquiry into the incident. On the basis of the facts disclosed at the enquiry, the Government have come to the conclusion that the Sub-Inspector of police was justified in having ordered the opening of fire.

The inquiry also disclosed that there were lapses on the part of some of the police officers. The officers concerned have been dealt with departmentally.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Sir, what is the offence for which this Kannan was arrested? Is it a fact that when in the police lock-up he was seriously manhandled and as a result received grave injuries?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : He was arrested for being found in a drunken state.

SRI A. RATNAM : கண்ணன் அவர்கள் குடித்திருந்தார் என்பதற்காக அவரை போலீஸ் கொடூரமாக அடித்து நொறுக்கியதைக்கண்டு ஜனங்கள் ஆத்திரம் அடைந்து கூடினர். ஏறக்குறைய 500 ஜனங்கள் போலீஸ் தடை வரம்பை மீறி கூடும்படியான நிலைமையை போலீஸ்காரர்கள் ஏற்படுத்தியிருக்கிறார்கள். அவ்வளவு ஜனங்கள் போலீஸ் மீது படையெடுக்கும்படியான மோசமான நிலைமையை போலீஸ் அதிகாரிகள் ஏன் உண்டாக்கினார்கள் என்பதற்குக் காரணம் கூற முடியுமா ?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : கண்ணன் நொறுக்கப்பட்டு அடி பட்டான் என்பதற்கு எந்த விதமான சாட்சியமும் இல்லை. அப்படி அடித்திருந்தாலும் 300 அல்லது 400 பேர்கள் போலீஸ் ஸ்டேஷனை தாக்குவது என்பது அனுமதிக்க முடியாத காரியம். காரியம் எது நடந்திருந்தாலும் அதைப்பற்றி விசாரிக்க அதிகாரிகள் இருக்கின்றார்கள். ஜனங்களே பார்த்து நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பது என்பது சரியல்ல. ஜனங்கள் அவர்களே 300 அல்லது 400 பேர்கள்வந்து சட்ட திட்டங்களின் வரம்பை மீறுவதை அனுமதித்தால் சட்டத்தை நிலை நாட்ட முடியாது என்பதை கனம் அங்கத்தினருக்குத் தெரிவித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

SRI E. L. RAGHAVA MUDALIAR : Sir, is it not a fact that Kannan had grievous injuries on his person? If so, how did he come by them?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : There was no grievous injury. A few abrasions were there. It may be that Kannan might have been manhandled by the police.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Sir, the Hon. Minister said that the persons guilty of lapses were properly dealt with. May I know how they were dealt with?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Their increment was stopped for one year.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Sir, apart from the fact that this Kannan was involved in a prohibition offence, is it not a fact that there is politics behind this matter and because he belonged to an Anti-Congress Party he was manhandled by the police authorities in the police station?

[26th November 1955

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I am afraid this is purely the imagination of the hon. Member. There is absolutely no basis for that.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : The Hon. the Leader has himself admitted that it is possible that Kannan might have been manhandled inside the police station. In view of the fact that the police are the custodians of law and order in this country, what is the action that the Government have thought it fit to take against the officials concerned in the matter?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I have already pointed out that there was no positive proof that he was manhandled. That is why I said it might have been possible. But there was no proof at all. Action was taken not for this but for the lapses on the part of the Sub-Inspectors of the two Police stations. The Sub-Inspector of this particular police station, when he returned from some other duty, found a large crowd which demanded that Kannan should be given medical treatment at the police station itself. Instead of deputing a police constable to bring the Medical Officer, the Sub-Inspector himself undertook the task of bringing the Medical Officer and the situation grew worse during his absence. That he should not have done. That is one lapse.

As far as the Town Police Sub-Inspector is concerned, even after hearing that there was serious trouble in the Taluk Police station he did not go there. He sent only a Head constable and two other constables. He also failed in his duty in not proceeding to the police station immediately. That was the lapse on the part of the other Police Sub-Inspector. For these two lapses disciplinary action was taken against them.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : From the statement made by the Hon. Minister it is clear that the crowd had collected there, not with the object of doing any injury to the police station, but their main demand was that Kannan should be taken to the hospital and medical attention should be given to him. That was the immediate demand according to the statement of the Hon. the Leader of the House.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : The hon. Member did not hear me properly. The crowd demanded that Kannan should not be taken out of the police station but that the Medical Officer should be brought to the police station and that was why the Sub-Inspector went to fetch the Medical Officer. But the Medical Officer stated that Kannan should be brought to the hospital and that he would not go to the police station. When the police wanted to take Kannan to the dispensary, then the crowd grew unruly and threw stones.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : In any case it is clear that the fury of the mob had been incited as a result of certain injuries committed on the person of Kannan. That was how the anger of the

people has been roused. There is no use of the Government accusing the people. People cannot go and attack a police station. But the question here is one of dealing with the psychology of a large number of people and because the police authorities there had failed to deal with the psychology of the masses and had misbehaved, it has resulted in the death of two persons. Do the Government think that merely stopping the increment of the Police officers is a sufficient punishment?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: The Sub-Inspectors were not punished in respect of the firing which took place. As a matter of fact, after an enquiry, the Government have come to the conclusion that the firing was justified in the circumstances. The point for consideration is this. No doubt, the original intention of the mob might have been *bona fide* and lawful. It may be one of, just going there and finding out what has happened to Kannan and demanding something from the Police Sub-Inspector. But without stopping there, they have proceeded further. As a matter of fact, the crowd caused mischief by taking hold of the records there and even pelted stones. After all, the hon. Member is quite well aware how mob psychology works. Even though the mob may be quite law-abiding in the beginning, the mob psychology develops and if somebody starts the trouble, the entire mob takes it up. That is how the whole trouble arose. Once that situation had arisen, it was the duty of the police to see that the crowd was dispersed. In spite of a lathi-charge, they would not disperse but they came back and attacked the police station. Necessarily firing had to be resorted to and that is the finding of a Judicial enquiry into the matter.

SRI S. DAIVASIGAMONEY: The Hon. Minister stated that there was an enquiry by the Sub-Collector of a certain place. May I know whether he enquired of the people round about the place of disturbance or whether he enquired of only some of the departmental officials and made an haphazard enquiry? Is it not the paramount duty of the Government to see that the confidence of the public in the State Government is not shaken? 9-50 a.m.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: I am sure the Sub-Collector would have made a proper enquiry into the matter and there is no information with me to show that it was a haphazard enquiry. If the hon. Member has information that there was only a haphazard enquiry, he may make a representation. In the absence of any particulars to the contrary, I take it that there was a proper enquiry.

SRI C. KANDASAMY: இந்தச் சம்பவங்களின் காரணமாக எந்தக் குற்றத்திற்காக ஸ்ரீ கண்ணன் கைது செய்யப்பட்டாரோ, அந்தக் குற்றத்திற்காக தண்டிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறாரா?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: I am sorry I do not have information with reference to that.

[26th November 1955

SRI V. GOPALA GOUNDER : The Hon. Minister said that the intention of the mob was to do mischief. Was any mischief done, was any property of the police station damaged and was the firing resorted to to defend property or in self-defence?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : All the records were thrown about and some records were torn. One of the persons caught hold of the Sub-Inspector and tore off the left sleeve of his shirt. Another person gave a blow to a police constable with a stick which caused a bleeding injury to him.

* 2909 *Q.*—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government or the Superintendent of Police, Malabar, received complaints in February–March 1955 against the indifferent attitude of the Mannarghat Police in Walluvanad taluk, Malabar district, in dealing with the crimes committed by an organized gang headed by one K. D. Kunchunni in and around Pulappatta village; and

(*b*) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (*a*) No complaints were received by the Government. A pseudonymous petition on the subject, purporting to be from the public of Mannarghat station limits was received by the District Superintendent of Police, Malabar district, on 17th February 1955.

(*b*) The petition was enquired into and suitable action taken by the District Superintendent of Police, Malabar district.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : The K.D. whose name is given in the question and who was responsible for a series of crimes, was actually in the custody of the Head constable and the Head constable allowed him to escape. Have the Government any information on this point and, if not, will they make an enquiry?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : When the Head constable was questioned, he said that the person in his custody was not this particular K.D. but only his brother. On enquiry it was found that it was false and action was taken against him.

SRI K. KUNHI MOHAMED SHAFEE : May I know the nature of crimes said to have been committed by this person and the action taken against him?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : He is accused of dacoity and he is a proclaimed offender. He is still absconding.

Local Fund Hospital at Gingee

* 2910 *Q.*—SRI A. GOVINDASAMY NAYAGAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that an additional building is under construction for the Local Fund Hospital at Gingee in the South Arcot district under the Local Development Scheme ; and